

## Waste Reduction & Recycling Grant Application Program Priority System

**Purpose:** To provide funding for:

- Technical & financial assistance to political subdivisions for creation of recycling systems and for modification of present recycling systems
- Recycling and waste reduction projects, including public education, planning and technical assistance
- Market development for recyclable materials separated by generators, including public education, planning and technical assistance
- Capital assistance for establishing private and public intermediate processing facilities for recyclable materials and facilities using recyclable materials in new products
- Programs which develop and implement composting of yard waste and composting with sewage sludge
- Technical assistance for waste reduction and waste exchange for waste generators
- Programs to assist communities and counties to develop and implement household hazardous management programs
- Capital assistance for establishing private and public facilities to manufacture combustible waste products and to incinerate combustible waste to generate and recover energy resources, except that no disbursements shall be made under this section for scrap tire processing related to tire-derived fuel

**Object of Program Priority Point System:** To enable grant reviewers to objectively and more quantitatively review proposals in order to score applications commensurate with the impact the program design and implementation will have on increased the reduction of waste, increased recycling, composting, market development for recyclables, public education and planning, increased technical assistance, implementation of household hazardous management programs in the service area.

1) How well was the project and the project accomplishments explained	Points
A) Explained well	5
B) Explained well, but needs more details	4
C) Explained fairly well, but needs more details	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

2) How well does the timeline list specific tasks, milestones dates and accomplishments during the year	Points
A) Explained well	5
B) Explained well, but needs more details	4
C) Explained fairly well, but needs more details	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

3) How well is the service area defined	Points
A) Defined well	5

B) Defined well, but needs a little more detail	4
C) Defined, but needs more details	3
D) Defined as a general area, a lot of detail is needed	2
E) Mentioned but not defined	1
F) No area provided	0

4) Project's benefits for service area	Points
A) Defined well	5
B) Defined well, but needs a little more detail	4
C) Defined, but needs more details	3
D) Defined as a general area, a lot of detail is needed	2
E) Mentioned but not defined	1
F) Not defined	0

5) Project need determination	Points
A) Defined well	5
B) Defined well, but needs a little more detail	4
C) Defined, but needs more details	3
D) Defined as a general area, a lot of detail is needed	2
E) Mentioned but not defined	1
F) Not defined	0

6) Applicant provides a mechanism to measure / analyze project effectiveness	Points
A) Gives desired quality results	5
B) Gives desired quality results but needs more details	4
C) Does not accurately measure / analyze program effectiveness, but needs more details	3
D) Does not measure and / or analyze all project results, but needs a lot more detail	2
E) Does not measure and / or analyze project effectiveness but some data is collected	1
F) No mechanism to measure / analyze project effectiveness used	0

7) Explanation for project determination achieving demonstrable direct results	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable and relatable to demonstrable results	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable and relatable to demonstrable results	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable and relatable to demonstrable results, but needs more details	3
D) Explanation given is vague and not relatable to demonstrable results, needs more detail	2
E) Direct demonstrable results were mentioned but no explanation given	1
F) No explanation for achieving demonstrable results given	0

8) Determination if providers of similar services as this project are in area and how this project is different	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable and relatable to project differences	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable and relatable to project	4

differences	
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable and relatable to project differences, more details needed	3
D) Explanation given is vague and not relatable to project differences, more details needed	2
E) Other providers were mentioned but no explanation for the project difference is given	1
F) No explanation about providers of same service or project differences given	0

9) Possibility of project partners	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

10) Project continuation after funding has ended	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

11) Program to promote end-markets for recycled materials and / or purchase of products made of recycled materials	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

12) Program to create end-use markets for recyclables in Nebraska	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

13) Does the program increase the value or marketability of the recycled materials	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2

E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

14) Recycling program and identification of markets for recyclables collected or processed	Points
A) Explanation given is understandable	5
B) Explanation given is mostly understandable	4
C) Explanation given is somewhat understandable, more details needed	3
D) Explained poorly, requires more details	2
E) Mentioned but not explained	1
F) No explanation provided	0

**The remaining portion of the Program Priority System is for use by the NDEQ Planning & Aid staff. The points awarded in the following sections are derived from mathematical calculations and not based on the objective opinion of reviewers.**

#### **TYPE OF PROGRAM:**

The following table indicates how each program will be rated on the basis of the type of program submitted for funding. The rating is commensurate with EPA's Waste Management Hierarchy from the most preferred to the least preferred method of managing waste.

##### Ranking Points

- Volume Reduction at the Source, and/or Toxicity Reduction 5 points
- Reuse, Recycling and Vegetative Waste Composting 4 points
- Land Disposal and Incineration with Energy Recovery 3 points
- Incineration for Volume Reduction without Energy Recovery 2 points
- Studies on Volume Reduction at the Source, Toxicity Reduction, Recycling, Reuse, Vegetative Waste Composting, or Land Disposal 1 point

**UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES:** Grantees are highly encouraged to utilize all available resources including cash match and in-kind donations.

##### Ranking Points:

- 100% cash and in-kind donation match 10 points
- 90-99% cash and in-kind donation match 9 points
- 80-89% cash and in-kind donation match 8 points
- 70-79% cash and in-kind donation match 7 points
- 60-69% cash and in-kind donation match 6 points
- 50-59% cash and in-kind donation match 5 points
- 40-49% cash and in-kind donation match 4 points
- 30-39% cash and in-kind donation match 3 points
- 20%-29% cash and in-kind donation match 2 points
- 10% -19% cash and in-kind donation match 1 point
- Less than 10% cash or in-kind donation match 0 points